R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 750 FL 000 364

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCORES ON THE MLA FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TESTS FOR TEACHERS AND ADVANCED STUDENTS AND RATINGS OF TEACHER COMPETENCE.

BY- MYERS, CHARLES T. MELTON, RICHARD S.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, PRINCETON, N.J.

REPORT NUMBER TDR-64-4 PUB DATE APR 64
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.16 29P.

DESCRIPTORS- *INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), *LANGUAGE TEACHERS, *MODERN LANGUAGES, *TEACHER RATING, *TEST RESULTS, LANGUAGE TESTS, STATISTICAL DATA, TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS, MLA FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TESTS, NDEA FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTITUTES, PRINCETON

DURING THE SUMMER OF 1963, APPROXIMATELY 3,000 TEACHERS ATTENDING NDEA FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTITUTES WERE TESTED AND EVALUATED FOR COMPETENCY. THIS DOCUMENT DESCRIBES THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RATINGS GIVEN THEM BY FACULTY GROUPS AT THE INSTITUTES AND THEIR SCORES ON THE MLA FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TESTS FOR TEACHERS AND ADVANCED STUDENTS. MORE THAN ONE-HALF OF THE REPORT IS A SERIES OF TABULATED SUMMARIES SHOWING THE SCORE RANGES AND THE DEGREE OF CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE TESTS AND THE RATINGS. THE CORRESPONDENCE WAS GREATEST FOR THE FOUR BASIC LANGUAGE SKILLS TESTS AND LEAST FOR THE TESTS IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS, CIVILIZATION AND CULTURE, AND PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION. ALSO INCLUDED IS A CHECKLIST OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS. (GJ)

364

ED011750

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCORES ON THE MLA FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TESTS FOR TEACHERS AND ADVANCED STUDENTS AND RATINGS OF TEACHER COMPETENCE

Charles T. Myers

and

Richard S. Melton

April, 1964

TDR-64-4

FL 000 364

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE

Princeton, New Jersey Los Angeles, California

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TEST SCORES AND QUALITATIVE EVALUATIONS

This report describes the relationship between scores on the MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students and qualitative ratings given to approximately 3,000 of the teachers who attended NDEA Foreign Language Institutes during the summer of 1963. The scores were obtained by the teachers on the seven tests in Form B of the MLA battery which was administered at the conclusion of the instructional program at each institute — tests of Listening Comprehension, Speaking, Reading, Writing, Applied Linguistics, Civilization and Culture, and Professional Preparation. The ratings were assigned by members of the faculties of the institutes on a four-point scale: Superior, Good, Minimal, and Unsatisfactory. The scale on which the ratings were based is the statement of "Qualifications for Secondary School Teachers of Foreign Languages," formulated by the Modern Language Association in 1955. (See Appendix A.) In almost all cases the ratings were given by faculty groups rather than by individual faculty members. At the time the ratings were given, official scores for Form B had not been reported. Indeed, in many institutes the tests had not yet been administered when the ratings were given. This report presents tables showing the relationship between test scores and ratings for these teachers.

Table 1 lists the score ranges corresponding to the four ratings — Superior, Good, Minimal, and Unsatisfactory — for each of the seven tests. The procedure used for determining the score ranges was that of dividing the score distributions into four groups in such a way that the per cent in each group would

Table 1

Table of Score Ranges

Defined by Percentages of Individuals Receiving Ratings

of Superior, Good, Minimal, and Unsatisfactory

Test		Language: French	German	Russian	Spanish	Composite
Listening Comprehension	S	52 - 58	48 - 58	47 - 57	48 - 56	
	G	40 - 51	35 - 47	36 - 46	39 - 47	
	M	32 - 39	29 - 34	? - 35	31 - 38	
	U	20 - 31	16 - 28	24 - ?	21 - 30	
Speaking	S	102 - 128	109 - 138	93 - 123	92 - 121	
	G	80 - 101	88 - 108	80 - 92	75 - 91	
	M	58 - 79	69 - 87	? - 79	58 - 74	
	U	17 - 57	8 - 68	30 - ?	14 - 57	
Reading	S	55 - 69	58 - 70	41 - 71	53 - 69	
	G	42 - 54	42 - 57	31 - 40	40 - 52	
	M	30 - 41	34 - 41	? - 30	32 - 39	
	U	19 - 29	23 - 33	20 - ?	20 - 31	
Writing	S	61 - 77	64 - 77	70 - 81	66 - 81	
	G	45 - 60	45 - 63	44 - 69	48 - 65	
	M	28 - 44	30 - 44	? - 43	34 - 47	
	U	18 - 27	18 - 29	25 - ?	22 - 33	
Applied Linguistics	S	63 - 76	66 - 75	53 - 67	61 - 74	
	G	52 - 62	54 - 65	43 - 52	51 - 60	
	M	38 - 51	43 - 53	? - 42	39 - 50	
	U	17 - 37	20 - 42	25 - ?	20 - 38	
Civilization and Culture	S	59 - 79	62 - 83	60 - 81	66 - 81	
	G	48 - 58	50 - 61	47 - 59	53 - 65	
	M	37 - 47	39 - 49	? - 46	43 - 52	
	U	19 - 36	20 - 38	23 - ?	21 - 42	
Professional Preparation	S	75 - 84	73 - 84	70 - 84	73 - 84	74 - 84
	G	66 - 74	65 - 72	59 - 69	65 - 72	65 - 73
	M	55 - 65	53 - 64	? - 58	51 - 64	53 - 64
	U	25 - 54	25 - 52	25 - ?	25 - 50	25 - 52

Note that this table is descriptive of the test score distributions for a selected group of teachers at the 1963 NDEA summer institutes and is based on percentages of individuals who received the four ratings. The score ranges are such that the number of individuals who were in each of the four ranges was approximately equal to the number of individuals who received corresponding ratings.

be as close as possible to the per cent in the comparable rating category. For example, 214 individuals were rated Superior for French Listening Comprehension, approximately 17 per cent of the 1,279 for whom test scores and ratings were available. In this same group, 211 persons had scores of 52 or higher (while 260 had scores of 51 or higher). Therefore 52 to 58 was designated as the score range corresponding to the category of Superior. Similarly, there were 530 individuals rated Good in French Listening Comprehension and there were 507 individuals whose scores were in the interval from 40 to 51. Therefore that interval was established as corresponding to a rating of Good. All other score ranges were identified in the same way except in the case of the Russian tests. Since there were not enough participants at the Russian institutes to allow for a distinction between the two lowest categories, only three score ranges are reported.

For the Professional Preparation Test an additional column of score ranges is presented. This test, which is in English, was the same for institutes of all four languages. The score ranges listed in the right-hand (Composite) column are based on the score distribution of all groups combined.

The score ranges in Table 1 should not be viewed as absolute or definitive. In the first place, the correlations between the test scores and the corresponding ratings were not perfect (and should not be expected to be perfect). Hence, it cannot be said that a person whose test score is in the Superior range would necessarily be rated Superior in that skill by an institute staff. Furthermore, neither the score nor the rating was designed to be a predictor of the other; both the test score and the rating were designed to be estimates of teaching competence. The methods used in preparing Table 1

assume that neither the tests nor the ratings were perfectly valid, but that they were each equally valid estimates of teaching competence. Information describing the many sets of relationships between the tests and the ratings is listed in Appendix B.

Table B-1 in Appendix B shows the number of persons rated for each of the four languages and each of the seven skills, and it lists the number of persons placed in each of the four rating categories of Unsatisfactory, Minimal, Good and Superior. In addition, it shows the mean test score and the standard deviation of test scores for all groups. These data provide one means of assessing the degree of relationship between the test scores and the ratings — and the degree of overlap of the test scores in each of the rating categories. Inspection of this table indicates that in all cases there is a progression in mean scores from the lowest category to the highest; there are no inversions or reversals. On the other hand, inspection of the standard deviations indicates that there is a degree of overlap in the scores achieved by persons rated in different categories.

Tables B-2 through B-5 provide a second means of assessing the relationships between the test scores and the ratings for each of the language groups; these data are the correlation coefficients between each test and each rating (plus the correlations among the tests and among the ratings). The correlations of greatest interest in these tables have been underlined. For the French institutes (Table B-2) the correlations between tests and corresponding ratings ranged from a low of .36 for Professional Preparation to a high of .72 for Speaking.

For the German institutes (Table B-3) the correlations ranged from a low of .29 for Professional Preparation to a high of .74 for Speaking. For the Russian institutes (Table B-4) the correlations ranged from a low of .19 for Professional Preparation to a high of .68 for Writing. For the Spanish institutes (Table B-5) the correlations ranged from a low of .30 for Professional Preparation to a high of .70 for both Listening Comprehension and Speaking. In general, there seems to be a higher degree of relationship between test and rating for the four language skill tests than for the three other tests. It is because of these correlations that the ranges of scores presented in Table 1 cannot be interpreted as absolute, fixed cutting scores. The relationships between the test scores and the ratings, while generally of the magnitude obtained in this type of study, are not perfect.

Following these tables are seven more tables (one for each ability measured) which show in greater detail the relationship between each test and the corresponding rating scale. They contain cross-tabulations of the percentages of persons in each score range and in each rating category. For example, the tabulation for the French Listening Comprehension Test in Table B-6 shows that 16 per cent obtained test scores in the highest score range, from 52 to 58. In this group, 9 per cent were rated Superior and the remaining 7 per cent were rated Good. All 16 per cent thus received ratings above Minimal. In the next lower score range for French Listening Comprehension, scores from 40 to 51 inclusive, there were 40 per cent. In this group 7 per cent were rated Superior, 24 per cent were rated Good and 8 per cent were rated Minimal; thus

all 40 per cent were rated Minimal or better. (It should be noted that in these tables a zero is used to indicate a value of less than one-half of one per cent and a dash is used to represent no cases at all.)

The score ranges listed at the left of each of these tables (Tables B-6 through B-12) extend from the lowest possible score to the highest possible score. The range in parentheses at the foot of the column shows the range of scores actually obtained by the sample. The per cents with double underlining in the diagonals represent agreement between the test and the ratings. The per cents adjacent to the diagonal are underlined once; they represent close agreement between the test and the ratings. To the right of each table is a double underlined figure which is the sum of the four per cents in the diagonal. The single underlined figure is the sum of the six per cents adjacent to the diagonal. The sum of these two figures thus represents the per cent of "close" agreement between the test and the ratings; these sums range from a low of 91 per cent to a high of 100 per cent.

It should be noted that a purely random relationship would produce a certain percentage of agreements between a test and a rating, as in the following hypothetical table, in which is shown the per cent of ratings that would fall by chance in the four categories — Unsatisfactory, Minimal, Good, and Superior.

Score Range	Per cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per cent
31-40	2	6	8	4	20
21-30	4	12	16	8	40
11-20	3	9	12	6	30
0-10	1	3	4	2	10
0-40	10	30	40	20	100

30* 46**

* Sum of per cents along diagonal

** Sum of per cents adjacent to diagonal

In the above theoretical chance distribution 30 per cent were placed in the same category by both score and rating and an additional 46 per cent were in adjacent categories.

In comparison, for the 1,279 teachers for whom the relationship between rating and score on the French Listening Comprehension Test is shown in Table B-6, Appendix B, 9 per cent were placed in the top category by both procedures, 24 per cent in the second category, 18 per cent in the third category, and 3 per cent in the lowest category by both procedures, a total 54 per cent classified the same by both. An additional 43 per cent were classified in adjacent categories, e.g., 7 per cent in the second score range were in the highest rating category, and so on. In only 1 per cent of the cases did the two evaluations differ by more than one category.

An additional table (Table B-13) has been prepared to provide comparisons among the four language groups on the results of the Professional Preparation Test, the only test that was the same for all. The score ranges for the four categories appear to be quite similar for each of the four languages in spite of the fact that the correlations between ratings and test scores were relatively quite low.

Discussion

The data of this report indicate that there was a positive relationship between the test scores and the qualitative ratings. The relationships were closer for the four skill tests than they were for the three non-skill tests (Applied Linguistics, Civilization and Culture, and Professional Preparation). This means that the table giving score ranges corresponding to the qualitative ratings can be relied upon more heavily in the case of the four skills than in the case of the three non-skill tests. However, these data cannot substitute for professional judgment in the evaluation of language teachers. First of all, there are seven different tests, and it will be a rare teacher who achieves a set of scores that place him uniformly into one rating category. The great majority of language teachers will exhibit a "pattern" of abilities — high degrees of skill in some areas, and moderate or low degrees of skill in other. Secondly, tests can provide only part of the description of an individual. Test information must be supplemented by other information. Finally, the results of this study indicate that there is not a one-to-one correspondence between the test scores and the ratings. The relationships

are only approximative. However, the results do indicate that persons with high scores on these tests are more likely to be judged Superior than persons with low scores, and for that reason the tests may be found to be useful in the evaluation of language teachers if properly used.

SUMMARY

This report summarizes the results of a study of the correspondence between the Modern Language Association Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students and qualitative ratings made of over 3,000 teachers who attended the 1963 NDEA summer institutes for French, German, Russian, and Spanish teachers. The report presents a table of score ranges associated with ratings of Superior, Good, Minimal, and Unsatisfactory (as defined by the Modern Language Association) and applied by the faculties of the institutes. It also presents data showing the degree of correspondence between the tests and the ratings.

The correspondence was greatest for the four language-skill tests — Listening Comprehension, Speaking, Reading, and Writing — and least for the tests of Applied Linguistics, Civilization and Culture, and Professional Preparation. Accordingly, less reliance can be placed on the score ranges presented for the latter three tests. Even with the skill tests, however, professional judgment must be exercised; test scores can be most appropriately used when they are supplemented by other pertinent information.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

APPENDIX A

Qualifications

for

Secondary School Teachers of Foreign Languages

QUALIFICATIONS FOR TEACHERS OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

A Modification of the 1955 MLA Statement
Qualifications for Secondary School Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages

COMPETENCE	SUPERIOR	GOOD	MINIMAL
Listening Comprehension	Ability to follow closely and with ease all types of standard speech, such as rapid or group conversation and mechanically transmitted speech.	Ability to understand conversation of normal tempo, lectures, and news broadcasts.	Ability to get the sense of what an educated native says when he is making a special effort to be understood and when he is speaking on a general and familiar subject.
Speaking	Ability to speak fluently, approximating native speech in vocabulary, intonation, and pronunciation. Ability to exchange ideas and to be at ease in social situations.	Ability to talk with a native without making glaring mistakes, and with a command of vocabulary and syntax sufficient to express one's thoughts in conversation at normal speed with reasonably good pronunciation.	Ability to read aloud and to talk on prepared topics (e.g. for classroom situations) without obvious faltering, and to use the common expressions needed for getting around in the foreign country, speaking with a pronunciation understandable to a native.
Reading	Ability to read almost as easily as in English, material of considerable difficulty.	Ability to read with immediate comprehension prose and verse of average difficulty and mature content.	Ability to grasp directly (i.e. without translating) the meaning of simple, non-technical prose, except for an occasional word.
Writing	Ability to write on a variety of subjects with idiomatic naturalness, ease of expression and and some feeling for the style of the language.	Ability to write a simple "free composition" such as a letter, with clarity and correctness in vocabulary, idiom and syntax.	Ability to write correctly sentences or paragraphs such as would be developed orally for classroom situations and to write a simple description or message without glaring errors.

COMPETENCE	SUPERIOR	GOOD	MINIMAL
Applied Linguistics	The "good" level of competency with additional knowledge of descriptive, comparative, and historical linguistics.	The "minimal" level of competency with additional knowledge of the development and present characteristics of the language.	Ability to apply to language teaching an understanding of the differences in the sound system, forms, and structures of the foreign language and English.
Culture	An enlightened understanding of the foreign people and their culture, such as is achieved through personal contact, through travel and residence abroad, through study of systematic descriptions of the foreign culture, and through study of literature and the arts.	The "minimal" level of competency with first-hand knowledge of some literary masterpieces and acquaintance with the geography, history, art, social customs, and contemporary civilization of the foreign people.	An awareness of language as an essential element of culture and an understanding of the principal ways in which the foreign culture differs from our own.
Professional Preparation	A mastery of recognized teaching methods, evidence of breadth and depth of professional outlook, and the ability to experiment with and evaluate new methods and techniques.	"Minimal" level of competency plus knowledge of the use of specialized techniques, such as audio-visual aids, and of the relation of language teaching to other areas of the curriculum. Ability to evaluate the professional literature of foreign language teaching.	Knowledge of the present-day objectives of the teaching of foreign languages as communication and an understanding of the methods and techniques for attaining these objectives.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

APPENDIX B

Tables Summarizing the Relationships Between Qualitative Ratings and Test Scores

Table B-1

Number of Persons, Means, and Standard Deviations
of Test Scores for Groups Rated in Each of Four Categories

	Total			U			M			G			S		
	No.	M	SD	No.	M	SD	No.	M	SD	No.	M	SD	No.	M	SD
Listening Comp.															
French	1279	41.9	8.3	123	32.4	3.5	412	36.8	5.6	530	44.5	6.7	214	50.9	5.6
German	328	41.4	9.5	25	30.0	5.9	67	34.4	5.9	132	40.3	7.5	104	50.1	6.5
Russian	137	43.8	7.2	1	34.0	-	19	35.8	2.9	61	43.0	5.7	56	47.6	7.0
Spanish	1410	42.2	7.3	88	32.1	3.9	358	36.5	5.5	562	42.7	5.7	402	48.6	4.4
Speaking															
French	1255	76.9	16.4	168	58.8	10.6	537	70.7	12.2	454	86.0	11.5	96	100.6	11.8
German	322	90.9	19.3	42	66.3	10.6	101	83.4	13.6	121	94.0	13.1	58	115.5	12.0
Russian	130	86.7	12.6	2	66.0	3.0	32	77.6	10.3	56	84.9	9.5	40	97.5	9.9
Spanish	1370	77.9	16.1	139	57.4	10.5	433	69.1	10.8	514	82.0	10.9	284	93.9	13.9
Reading															
French	1156	43.4	9.9	74	33.7	4.8	451	38.1	7.1	459	46.0	8.6	172	54.8	7.8
German	328	46.9	10.9	38	35.9	6.0	81	40.9	6.9	136	47.0	8.6	73	59.2	8.1
Russian	137	39.0	10.7	-	-	-	29	32.8	4.6	61	36.0	7.6	47	46.8	12.1
Spanish	1295	44.4	9.4	87	32.9	4.4	373	38.8	6.2	562	45.9	8.0	273	52.7	8.0
Writing															
French	1249	42.3	11.8	151	30.5	7.1	565	37.5	9.0	443	49.4	8.7	90	58.3	9.6
German	314	47.3	14.7	45	29.7	9.1	90	40.2	9.2	124	51.9	11.5	55	63.0	10.1
Russian	137	55.6	14.5	1	28.0	-	34	40.5	8.8	68	57.3	11.9	34	68.0	8.5
Spanish	1409	51.2	13.1	139	33.7	7.8	425	44.9	9.8	630	55.7	10.5	215	61.8	11.1
Applied Ling.															
French	1175	50.7	8.8	93	41.2	4.8	587	47.9	7.8	380	54.4	6.8	115	59.9	8.4
German	328	53.0	8.6	46	43.7	6.7	125	50.3	7.2	133	57.0	6.8	24	62.1	5.6
Russian	137	48.2	5.8	1	43.0	-	26	44.6	4.8	73	48.0	5.7	37	51.2	5.1
Spanish	1268	49.5	8.4	147	42.2	6.1	576	48.0	7.7	408	52.1	7.8	137	55.6	8.3
Civil. & Culture															
French	1207	48.1	8.2	98	42.1	6.5	536	45.6	7.0	445	50.2	7.6	128	55.4	8.9
German	328	53.0	9.1	14	46.1	5.7	116	49.0	7.3	133	54.2	8.4	65	59.0	9.4
Russian	137	51.9	8.5	-	-	-	34	47.6	6.7	79	52.9	8.0	24	54.8	9.9
Spanish	1268	55.8	8.7	89	48.5	7.3	395	51.7	7.5	583	58.2	7.7	201	60.5	8.4
Prof.Prep.															
French	1246	67.6	6.3	38	59.6	6.4	344	65.5	6.3	708	68.3	5.9	156	71.3	4.6
German	328	66.7	6.0	10	58.6	5.4	96	65.8	6.7	170	66.7	5.2	52	70.0	4.6
Russian	137	66.3	5.9	-	-	-	14	64.3	3.9	81	66.1	6.0	42	67.3	6.2
Spanish	1336	66.7	6.3	26	61.2	5.4	363	64.2	6.6	715	67.5	5.8	232	69.0	5.7

Table B-2

Intercorrelations Among Tests and Ratings

French Institutes (N = 1051)

Tests	Mean	Standard Deviation	L	S	R	W	AL	CC	PP	L	S	R	W	AL	CC	PP
Listening Comp.	41.70	8.26		.76	.81	.80	.65	.59	.46	.70	.66	.64	.62	.52	.53	.44
Speaking	76.18	16.31	.76		.71	.75	.60	.51	.35	.71	.72	.64	.62	.53	.55	.45
Reading	42.98	9.79	.81	.71		.83	.68	.66	.47	.62	.60	.63	.61	.51	.53	.39
Writing	42.45	12.00	.80	.75	.83		.72	.59	.47	.66	.64	.65	.67	.57	.53	.45
Applied Ling.	50.62	8.84	.65	.60	.68	.72		.60	.60	.50	.50	.50	.50	.55	.42	.38
Civil. & Cult.	47.97	8.16	.59	.51	.66	.59	.60		.55	.43	.42	.45	.45	.39	.43	.35
Prof. Prepar.	67.69	6.33	.46	.35	.47	.47	.60	.55		.28	.28	.32	.29	.40	.29	.36
Ratings																
Listening Comp.	1.67	.88	.70	.71	.62	.66	.50	.42	.28		.82	.73	.68	.57	.69	.57
Speaking	1.39	.83	.66	.72	.60	.64	.50	.42	.28	.82		.70	.66	.57	.65	.56
Reading	1.63	.81	.64	.64	.63	.65	.50	.45	.32	.73	.70		.77	.54	.63	.51
Writing	1.41	.78	.62	.62	.61	.67	.50	.45	.29	.68	.66	.77		.53	.57	.52
Applied Ling.	1.45	.78	.52	.53	.51	.57	.55	.39	.40	.57	.57	.54	.53		.51	.47
Civil. & Cult.	1.52	.78	.53	.55	.53	.53	.42	.43	.29	.69	.65	.63	.57	.51		.46
Prof. Prepar.	1.81	.69	.44	.45	.39	.45	.38	.35	.36	.57	.56	.51	.52	.47	.46	

Correlations between a test and the corresponding rating are underlined.
Ratings were placed on a scale from 3 for Superior to 0 for Unsatisfactory.

Table B-3

Intercorrelations Among Tests and Ratings

German Institutes (N = 312)

Tests	Mean	Standard Deviation	L	S	R	W	AL	CC	PP	L	S	R	W	AL	CC	PP
Listening Comp.	41.65	9.58		.83	.86	.79	.57	.61	.22	.69	.66	.67	.62	.42	.50	.39
Speaking	91.08	19.46	.83		.82	.85	.61	.61	.21	.74	.74	.69	.68	.44	.54	.43
Reading	47.31	10.87	.86	.82		.86	.64	.69	.24	.69	.66	.67	.66	.46	.50	.38
Writing	47.32	14.75	.79	.85	.86		.75	.65	.31	.72	.71	.69	.72	.54	.55	.46
Applied Ling.	53.25	8.62	.57	.61	.64	.75		.65	.52	.49	.46	.47	.51	.60	.45	.39
Civil. & Cult.	53.31	9.04	.61	.61	.69	.65	.65		.46	.53	.48	.51	.49	.51	.46	.35
Prof. Prepar.	66.84	5.94	.22	.21	.24	.31	.52	.46		.18	.14	.19	.17	.37	.30	.29
Ratings																
Listening Comp.	1.97	.91	.69	.74	.69	.72	.49	.53	.18		.87	.86	.82	.55	.69	.60
Speaking	1.62	.93	.66	.74	.66	.71	.46	.48	.14	.87		.86	.85	.48	.69	.61
Reading	1.76	.94	.67	.69	.67	.69	.47	.51	.19	.86	.86		.84	.53	.74	.62
Writing	1.61	.94	.62	.68	.66	.72	.51	.49	.17	.82	.85	.84		.49	.69	.61
Applied Ling.	1.43	.82	.42	.44	.46	.54	.60	.51	.37	.55	.48	.53	.49		.45	.47
Civil. & Cult.	1.74	.81	.50	.54	.50	.55	.45	.46	.30	.69	.69	.74	.69	.45		.58
Prof. Prepar.	1.81	.73	.39	.43	.38	.46	.39	.35	.29	.60	.61	.62	.61	.47	.58	

Correlations between a test and the corresponding rating are underlined.
Ratings were placed on a scale from 3 for Superior to 0 for Unsatisfactory.

Table B-4

Intercorrelations Among Tests and Ratings

Russian Institutes (N = 130)

Tests	Mean	Standard Deviation	L	S	R	W	AL	CC	PP	L	S	R	W	AL	CC	PP
Listening Comp.	43.53	7.13		.70	.75	.76	.54	.39	.05	.53	.57	.64	.68	.15	.47	.35
Speaking	86.68	12.64	.70		.55	.62	.44	.24	-.05	.62	.63	.62	.66	.25	.45	.36
Reading	38.68	10.38	.75	.55		.57	.38	.33	-.09	.41	.47	.49	.52	-.01	.32	.20
Writing	54.78	14.34	.76	.62	.57		.74	.42	.16	.50	.55	.65	.68	.26	.49	.32
Applied Ling.	47.96	5.95	.54	.44	.38	.74		.53	.41	.32	.37	.43	.46	.36	.31	.25
Civil. & Cult.	51.75	8.50	.39	.24	.33	.42	.53		.22	.13	.17	.26	.31	.12	.32	.04
Prof. Prepar.	66.33	5.82	.05	-.05	-.09	.16	.41	.22		.06	.05	.17	.15	.38	.17	.19
Ratings																
Listening Comp.	2.23	.72	.53	.62	.41	.50	.32	.13	.06		.79	.75	.68	.25	.40	.43
Speaking	2.03	.78	.57	.63	.47	.55	.37	.17	.05	.79		.75	.74	.28	.48	.49
Reading	2.11	.74	.64	.62	.49	.65	.43	.26	.17	.75	.75		.86	.27	.61	.44
Writing	1.96	.73	.68	.66	.52	.68	.46	.31	.15	.68	.74	.86		.29	.57	.51
Applied Ling.	2.03	.69	.15	.25	-.01	.26	.36	.12	.38	.25	.28	.27	.29		.36	.34
Civil. & Cult.	1.91	.64	.47	.45	.32	.49	.31	.32	.17	.40	.48	.61	.57	.36		.40
Prof. Prepar.	2.18	.60	.35	.36	.20	.32	.25	.04	.19	.43	.49	.44	.51	.34	.40	

Correlations between a test and the corresponding rating are underlined.
Ratings were placed on a scale from 3 for Superior to 0 for Unsatisfactory.

Table B-5

Intercorrelations Among Tests and Ratings

Spanish Institutes (N = 1223)

Tests	Mean	Standard Deviation	L	S	R	W	AL	CC	PP	L	S	R	W	AL	CC	PP
Listening Comp.	42.13	7.38		.75	.77	.79	.38	.55	.25	.70	.69	.65	.59	.36	.54	.37
Speaking	77.66	16.19	.75		.69	.74	.26	.47	.11	.70	.70	.65	.58	.31	.48	.33
Reading	44.54	9.42	.77	.69		.84	.49	.64	.31	.61	.61	.62	.58	.36	.55	.34
Writing	51.03	13.00	.79	.74	.84		.47	.63	.30	.65	.66	.66	.62	.40	.57	.41
Applied Ling.	49.59	8.42	.38	.26	.49	.47		.55	.62	.27	.24	.32	.34	.43	.35	.33
Civil. & Cult.	55.90	8.66	.55	.47	.64	.63	.55		.49	.40	.40	.41	.41	.35	.43	.30
Prof. Prepar.	66.63	6.36	.25	.11	.31	.30	.62	.49		.16	.13	.17	.21	.32	.28	.30
Ratings																
Listening Comp.	1.91	.89	.70	.70	.61	.65	.27	.40	.16		.85	.79	.70	.41	.61	.44
Speaking	1.70	.92	.69	.70	.61	.66	.24	.40	.13	.85		.78	.73	.43	.61	.43
Reading	1.61	.84	.65	.65	.62	.66	.32	.41	.17	.79	.78		.77	.48	.68	.46
Writing	1.64	.86	.59	.58	.58	.62	.34	.41	.21	.70	.73	.77		.52	.64	.44
Applied Ling.	1.42	.83	.36	.31	.36	.40	.43	.35	.32	.41	.43	.48	.52		.54	.47
Civil. & Cult.	1.71	.82	.54	.48	.55	.57	.35	.43	.28	.61	.61	.68	.64	.54		.49
Prof. Prepar.	1.86	.71	.37	.33	.34	.41	.33	.30	.30	.44	.43	.46	.44	.47	.49	

Correlations between a test and the corresponding rating are underlined.
Ratings were placed on a scale from 3 for Superior to 0 for Unsatisfactory.

Table B-6

Listening Comprehension

FRENCH (N=1279)

Score Range	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent
52 - 58	--	0	7	9	16
40 - 51	0	8	24	7	40
32 - 39	6	18	9	0	34
20 - 31	3	6	1	0	10
(22 - 58)	10	32	41	17	100

54* 43**

GERMAN (N=328)

Score Range	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent
48 - 58	0	1	8	23	33
35 - 47	1	9	23	7	40
29 - 34	4	7	6	1	19
16 - 28	2	3	3	--	8
(18 - 58)	8	20	40	32	100

55* 37**

RUSSIAN (N=137)

Score Range	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent
47 - 57	--	--	15	25	39
36 - 46	--	6	26	15	46
? - 35	1	8	4	1	15
24 - ?					
(32 - 57)	1	14	45	41	100

59* 41**

SPANISH (N=1410)

Score Range	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent
48 - 56	--	1	9	19	29
39 - 47	0	7	23	9	39
31 - 38	4	14	8	1	26
21 - 30	2	3	1	--	6
(21 - 56)	6	25	40	29	100

58* 40**

*Sum of per cents along the diagonal
**Sum of per cents adjacent to the diagonal

Table B-7

Speaking

FRENCH (N=1255)

Score Range	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
102 - 128	--	1	3	3	7		
80 - 101	0	8	23	5	36		
58 - 79	7	27	9	0	43		
17 - 57	6	7	0	--	14		
(33 - 126)	13	43	36	8	100	59*	39**

GERMAN (N=322)

Score Range	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
109 - 138	--	1	4	14	19		
88 - 108	0	11	22	4	37		
69 - 87	5	16	10	0	31		
8 - 68	8	4	1	--	13		
(41 - 135)	13	31	38	18	100	60*	38**

RUSSIAN (N=130)

Score Range	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
93 - 123	--	2	8	20	31		
80 - 92	--	8	25	11	44		
? - 79	2	15	9	0	25		
30 - ?							
(52 - 119)	2	25	43	31	100	60*	36**

SPANISH (N=1370)

Score Range	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
92 - 121	--	1	8	13	21		
75 - 91	1	10	21	6	37		
58 - 74	5	17	8	2	31		
14 - 57	5	4	1	0	10		
(31 - 119)	10	32	38	21	100	56*	41**

*Sum of per cents along the diagonal
**Sum of per cents adjacent to the diagonal

Table B-8

Reading

FRENCH (N=1156)

Score Range	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
55 - 69	--	1	7	8	16		
42 - 54	1	12	20	6	38		
30 - 41	5	23	12	1	40		
19 - 29	1	4	1	--	6		
(24 - 69)	6	39	40	15	100	52*	46**

GERMAN (N=327)

Score Range	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
58 - 70	0	1	6	15	22		
42 - 57	1	10	23	6	40		
34 - 41	6	10	10	1	27		
23 - 33	4	4	2	0	11		
(28 - 70)	11	25	42	22	100	52*	42**

RUSSIAN (N=137)

Score Range	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
41 - 71		1	10	23	34		
31 - 40		14	23	7	44		
? - 30		6	11	5	22		
20 - ?							
(23 - 68)		21	45	34	100	52*	42**

SPANISH (N=1295)

Score Range	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
53 - 69	--	1	9	11	21		
40 - 52	0	11	24	9	44		
32 - 39	4	14	9	1	29		
20 - 31	2	3	1	0	6		
(20 - 68)	7	29	43	21	100	51*	45**

*Sum of per cents along the diagonal
**Sum of per cents adjacent to the diagonal

Table B-9

Writing

FRENCH (N=1249)

Score Ranges	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
61 - 77	--	0	3	4	7		
45 - 60	0	10	22	3	35		
28 - 44	7	28	10	0	46		
18 - 27	4	7	0	0	12		
(18 - 73)	12	45	35	7	100	58*	40**

GERMAN (N=314)

Score Ranges	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
64 - 77	--	--	7	10	17		
45 - 63	1	12	23	6	42		
30 - 44	6	12	8	1	27		
18 - 29	8	5	2	--	14		
(18 - 76)	14	29	39	18	100	53*	44**

RUSSIAN (N=137)

Score Ranges	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
70 - 81	--	--	10	15	25		
44 - 69	--	7	32	10	49		
? - 43	1	18	7	--	26		
25 - ?							
(27 - 80)	1	25	50	25	100	65*	35**

SPANISH (N=1409)

Score Ranges	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
66 - 81	--	1	9	6	16		
48 - 65	1	11	26	7	44		
34 - 47	4	15	9	2	30		
22 - 33	5	4	1	0	10		
(22 - 81)	10	30	45	15	100	52*	44**

*Sum of per cents along the diagonal
**Sum of per cents adjacent to the diagonal

Table B-10

Applied Linguistics

FRENCH (N=1175)

Score Ranges	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
63 - 76	--	2	3	4	9		
52 - 62	0	13	18	4	35		
38 - 51	6	30	10	2	49		
17 - 37	2	5	1	0	7		
(28 - 76)	8	50	32	10	100	54*	41**

GERMAN (N=328)

Score Ranges	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
66 - 75	--	1	4	2	7		
54 - 65	1	11	25	5	42		
43 - 53	5	20	12	1	38		
20 - 42	7	6	0	--	13		
(29 - 74)	14	38	41	7	100	54*	43**

RUSSIAN (N=137)

Score Ranges	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
53 - 67	--	1	13	12	26		
43 - 52	1	12	29	13	55		
? - 42	--	6	11	2	19		
25 - ?							
(36 - 61)	1	19	53	26	100	47*	49**

SPANISH (N=1268)

Score Ranges	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
61 - 74	--	3	5	3	11		
51 - 60	1	14	13	4	34		
39 - 50	7	23	12	3	45		
20 - 38	4	6	2	0	11		
(29 - 70)	12	45	32	11	100	43*	48**

*Sum of per cents along the diagonal
**Sum of per cents adjacent to the diagonal

Table B-11

Civilization and Culture

FRENCH (N=1207)

Score Ranges	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
59 - 79	0	2	5	4	12		
48 - 58	2	14	17	4	38		
37 - 47	5	24	13	2	44		
19 - 36	1	4	1	0	7		
(27 - 75)	8	44	37	11	100	46*	45**

GERMAN (N=328)

Score Ranges	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
62 - 83	--	2	9	9	20		
50 - 61	1	15	19	8	42		
39 - 49	2	16	12	3	34		
20 - 38	1	2	1	0	4		
(31 - 81)	7	31	46	16	100	48*	45**

RUSSIAN (N=137)

Score Ranges	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
60 - 81		1	12	6	18		
47 - 59		15	33	9	56		
? - 46		9	13	3	26		
23 - ?							
(35 - 74)		25	58	18	100	48*	49**

SPANISH (N=1268)

Score Ranges	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
66 - 81	0	2	8	5	15		
53 - 65	2	12	27	8	48		
43 - 52	4	15	10	3	31		
21 - 42	1	3	1	0	6		
(31 - 81)	7	31	46	16	100	48*	45**

*Sum of per cents along the diagonal
**Sum of per cents adjacent to the diagonal

Table B-12

Professional Preparation

FRENCH (N=1246)

Score Ranges	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
75 - 84	--	1	7	4	11		
66 - 74	1	14	34	8	57		
55 - 65	2	11	14	1	29		
25 - 54	1	1	1	0	3		
(43 - 80)	3	27	57	13	100	50*	46**

GERMAN (N=328)

Score Ranges	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
73 - 84	--	4	6	5	15		
65 - 72	1	15	30	9	54		
53 - 64	2	8	16	2	27		
25 - 52	1	2	1	--	3		
(48 - 79)	3	29	52	16	100	44*	50**

RUSSIAN (N=137)

Score Ranges	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
70 - 84		1	15	10	27		
59 - 69		7	36	19	63		
? - 58		1	7	1	10		
25 - ?							
(48 - 83)		10	59	31	100	47*	48**

SPANISH (N=1336)

Score Ranges	Per Cent of Ratings U	M	G	S	Total Per Cent		
73 - 84	--	2	9	5	16		
65 - 72	0	12	31	9	53		
51 - 64	1	12	13	3	29		
25 - 50	0	1	0	0	2		
(34 - 81)	2	27	54	17	100	48*	45**

*Sum of per cents along the diagonal
*Sum of per cents adjacent to the diagonal

Table B-13

Professional Preparation

Score Ranges

LANGUAGE	U	M	G	S	MEAN
French	—54	55-65	66-74	75—	67.6
German	—52	53-64	65-72	73—	66.7
Russian	— ?	? -58	59-69	70—	66.3
Spanish	—50	51-64	65-72	73—	66.7
Combined	—52	53-64	65-73	74—	

Per Cent of Combined Groups

	U	M	G	S	TOTAL
74—	-	2	8	4	14
65-73	1	13	33	9	56
53-64	2	10	13	2	27
—52	0	1	1	0	2
Total	2	27	55	16	